

MEETING
STATE OF CALIFORNIA
INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT BOARD
DIVERSION, PLANNING AND LOCAL ASSISTANCE COMMITTEE

JOE SERNA JR., CALEPA BUILDING
SIERRA HEARING ROOM
1001 I STREET, 2ND FLOOR
SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 5, 2002
9:30 A.M.

JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
CERTIFIED SHORTHAND REPORTER
LICENSE NUMBER 10063

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES

COMMITTEE MEMBERS

Steven R. Jones, Chairperson

Jose Medina

Linda Moulton-Patterson

STAFF

Mark Leary, Executive Director

Kathryn Tobias, Chief Counsel

Pat Schiavo, Deputy Director

Eric Bissinger

Tricia Broddrick

Terri Edwards

Betty Fernandez

Keir Furey

Terri Gray

Cedar Kehoe

Nikki Mizwinski

Kyle Pogue

Zane Poulson

Jill Simmons

Carolyn Sullivan

Steve Uselton

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

APPEARANCES CONTINUED

STAFF

Melissa Vargas

Becky Williams

Tabetha Willmon

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX

PAGE

A. Roll Call And Declaration Of Quorum	1
B. Deputy Director's Report	2
C. Consideration Of The Implementation Plan For The School Diversion And Environmental Education Law (SB 373) (Note: September Board Item 2)	5
Motion	24
Vote	25
D. Item Deleted	25
E. PULLED Consideration Of An Integrated Waste Management Plan (IWMP) For The College Of Marin Pursuant To Public Resources Code 42920 (b) (3) (Note: September Board Item 4)	2
F. Consideration Of Staff Recommendation On The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The Following Jurisdictions:	
A. Los Angeles County: Westlake Village	
B. San Mateo County: East Palo Alto	
(Note: September Board Item 5)	26
Motion	28
Vote	28
G. Consideration Of The Amended Nondisposal Facility Element For The Merced County Solid Waste Regional Agency (Note: September Board Item 6)	28
Motion	29
Vote	29
H. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of La Canada Flintridge, Los Angeles County (Note: September Board Item 7)	29
Motion	35
Vote	36

INDEX CONTINUED

	PAGE
I. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Duarte, Los Angeles County (Note: September Board Item 8)	29
Motion	35
Vote	36
J. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Artesia, Los Angeles County (Note: September Board Item 9)	29
Motion	35
Vote	36
K. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Hawaiian Gardens, Los Angeles County (Note: September Board Item 10)	29
Motion	35
Vote	36
L. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Pasadena, Los Angeles County (Note: September Board Item 11)	29
Motion	35
Vote	36
M. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The County Of San Diego (Note: September Board Item 12)	36
Motion	38
Vote	38
N. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Alternative Diversion Requirement For The City of Galt, Sacramento County (Note: September Board Item 13)	38
Motion	40
Vote	40
O. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time Extension By The City Of Upland, San Bernardino County (Note: September Board Item 14)	41
Motion	42
Vote	42

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

P. Item Deleted

Q. Item Deleted

R. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time
Extension By The City Of San Carlos, San Mateo County
(Note: September Board Item 17) 42
Motion 44
Vote 44

S. Consideration Of The Application For A SB1066 Time
Extension By The City Of San Mateo, San Mateo County
(Note: September Board Item 18) 42
Motion 44
Vote 45

T. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review
Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling
Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For
The Unincorporated Area Of Santa Cruz County
(Note: September Board Item 19) 45
Motion 46
Vote 47

U. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review
Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling
Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For
The Unincorporated Area Of Placer County
(Note: September Board Item 20) 47
Motion 48
Vote 48

V. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review
Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling
Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For
The City Of Laguna Beach, Orange County (Note:
September Board Item 21) 48
Motion 50
Vote 50

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

W. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element, And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element, For The Unincorporated Area Of Yolo County (Note: September Board Item 22)	50
Motion	52
Vote	52

X. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 1999 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Pleasant Hill, Contra Costa County (Note: September Board Item 23)	52
Motion	54
Vote	55

Y. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 1997 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1997/1998 And 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Ukiah, Mendocino County (Note: September Board Item 24)	55
Motion	57
Vote	58

Z. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 1997 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1997/1998 And 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Willits, Mendocino County (Note: September Board Item 25)	55
Motion	58
Vote	58

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

AA. Consideration Of A Request To Change The Base Year To 2000 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element; And Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element For The City Of Solvang, Santa Barbara County (Note: September Board Item 26)	59
Motion	61
Vote	61
AB. Consideration Of Staff Recommendation To Change The Base Year To 1998 For The Previously Approved Source Reduction And Recycling Element, And Consideration Of The 1997/1998 And 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element, For The City Of San Fernando, Los Angeles County (Note: September Board Item 27)	61
Motion	64
Vote	64
AC. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element; And Consideration Of Issuance Of A Compliance Order Relative To The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The City Of Fortuna, Humboldt County (Note: September Board Item 28)	64
Motion	66
Vote	66
AD. PULLED Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element; And Consideration Of Issuance Of A Compliance Order Relative To The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The City Of Eureka, Humboldt County (Note: September Board Item 29)	25

INDEX CONTINUED

PAGE

AE. PULLED Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element; And Consideration Of Issuance Of A Compliance Order Relative To The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The City Of La Puente, Los Angeles County (Note: September Board Item 30) Motion Vote	
AF. Consideration Of The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The Source Reduction And Recycling Element And Household Hazardous Waste Element; And Consideration Of Issuance Of A Compliance Order Relative To The 1999/2000 Biennial Review Findings For The City Of Monterey Park, Los Angeles County	67
Public Comment	68
Adjournment	68
Reporter's Certificate	69

PETERS SHORTHAND REPORTING CORPORATION (916) 362-2345

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good morning. Welcome to the
3 September 5th meeting of the Diversion, Planning and Local
4 Assistance.

5 Jeannine, would you call the roll.

6 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Eaton?

7 Medina?

8 Moulton-Patterson?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Here.

10 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Here.

12 Mr. Medina is on his way. He got hung up this
13 morning, so he'll be here. What we're going to do -- Mr.
14 Eaton can't be here. He had some stuff scheduled before
15 the dates got changed on the Committee meeting, and he
16 couldn't get them changed.

17 So what we're going to do is open the meeting,
18 have the Deputy Director's report. You can do your item.
19 And then we'll hold on any vote until Mr. Medina gets
20 here, because we need a quorum.

21 If anybody wants to speak on any issue, there are
22 speaker slips in the back of the room. Just fill them
23 out, bring them up to Jeannine Bakulich, and she'll put
24 them forward, and you'll get to speak.

25 And if anybody's got cell phones, turn them to

1 vibrate or turn them off please so that we can get through
2 this meeting without Ma Bell or whoever.

3 All right. Any ex partes, Linda?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'm up to
5 date. Thank you.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. And I'm up to date.

7 Mr. Schiavo.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yes, sir.

9 Pat Schiavo, Diversion, Planning and Local
10 Assistance Division. I just want to give you an overview
11 of what's taking place within the division.

12 Regarding the status of the AB 939 reviews for
13 compliance with jurisdictions and meeting the 50 percent
14 goal, the Board has approved today, including this month,
15 215 jurisdictions have either met or exceeded the
16 50-percent goal or had been considered good faith effort
17 in achieving that goal.

18 There's been to date 65 time extensions approved,
19 and there's been alternative diversion rate jurisdictions.
20 There's been four of those. There's one -- well, three
21 potential jurisdictions being placed on compliance orders.

22 In addition, we anticipate there will be about 40
23 agenda items next month coming forward, ballpark. Those
24 numbers are always changing a little bit.

25 We also anticipate there's going to be 100 new

1 base years coming forward as a result of, you know, the
2 biennial review process.

3 And so, bottom line is we're getting towards the
4 end at least of this group. But we still will have that
5 100 outstanding new base-year jurisdictions that'll be
6 coming forward to complete that process.

7 Staff is currently working on draft disposal
8 reporting regulations. And once we get those in some kind
9 of shape, then we'll start bringing those forward for the
10 Board to look at, as well as public scrutiny, and any
11 formal processes.

12 Staff of the Diversion, Planning and Local
13 Assistance are coordinating closer with staff of Permits
14 and Enforcement regarding the 2136 program to look at the
15 diversion pieces of that as requested by Board members at
16 the last Board meeting.

17 Regarding the AB 75 program, state agency
18 program: There's 131 state agencies that have been
19 reviewed by staff to date. We've received 383 state
20 agency reports. There's 23 reports that are in process
21 that the state agency has not completed the report.
22 There's 8 state agencies in which we haven't gotten any
23 indication of them making any progress, which that
24 number's gone down significantly, so we're almost near the
25 end of that. So that's a total of 430 state agencies.

1 We've finally received a plan from the College of
2 Marin. It's the final plan. That was agendized for this
3 Board meeting, but we pulled it as a result of receiving
4 that. We also have their annual report.

5 So that closes the book on all plans for state
6 agencies. So that's been highly successful, and staff had
7 done a terrific job in getting those reports in. So we're
8 moving ahead on AB 75.

9 Regarding the education efforts, you're going to
10 be hearing today the culmination of the first piece, and
11 that's the big plan implementing AB 7373. And that will
12 be the first item up today.

13 So that's my segue.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That's your segue.

15 Any questions?

16 I just have one.

17 On these 100 base years, with all the activity
18 that's been happening to this Board for the last 8 months
19 dealing with base years, are you getting calls, are you
20 getting inquiries from jurisdictions wanting to know --
21 getting any guidance or anything, or is this --

22 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: No, staff are
23 constantly working with the jurisdictions, so it's an
24 ongoing process.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Because I know we've got some

1 base years today. I think one, you guys found quite a bit
2 of material that hadn't been done. And it seems like the
3 last couple of months were seeing some real positive base
4 years and not having to mess around too much with the huge
5 deductions.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: And then during the,
7 you know, the budget process we had to slow down on some
8 of the reviews that were a little further from Sacramento
9 just because of the budgetary constraints.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Sure.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: So we have a little bit
12 of a gap there. But we'll be bringing those forward hot
13 and heavy here.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Great.

15 All right. Your item.

16 MS. BRODDRICK: I'm on?

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: You're on.

18 MS. BRODDRICK: Good morning. I'm Trish
19 Broddrick and I'm from the Office of Integrated
20 Environmental Education.

21 And I have to just say how gratifying it is to be
22 here today and to actually have a plan to present to the
23 Board, because this truly has been a very unenlightening
24 and sometimes very arduous experience trying to get
25 consensus in building a viable plan that meets the

1 expectations and the needs of all the identified
2 stakeholders in the legislation. And those include all of
3 the education departments: The California Department of
4 Education; the Governor's Office of the Secretary of
5 Education; and probably most importantly, the State Board
6 of Education, who is responsible for setting all of the
7 education standards for all the subject areas, for all the
8 students in the State of California.

9 In addition, they're responsible for reviewing
10 and approving all of the state textbooks for the content
11 areas.

12 I wanted to speak also real quickly to the fact
13 that this is a very unique piece of legislation and taking
14 a very unique approach to education on the environment.
15 Because what it does -- in the past we have approached
16 education programs unilaterally from both the
17 instructional perspective, providing textbooks and
18 programs to teachers and training for teachers on the
19 environment, and then separately and distinctly working
20 with jurisdictions and school business and other
21 maintenance personnel to establish on-site programs.

22 This program indeed links the two together and
23 pulls the students out of the classroom, provides them
24 with the concept and the content, knowledge and
25 information to actually make some meaningful change on

1 their school campuses, come up with plans with the support
2 of all the stakeholders on the campus, and develop a
3 unified program.

4 This is what we call service learning, and this
5 is a good case in service learning.

6 So in that case I just wanted to thank the Board
7 because, you know, sitting in the Board meetings and
8 seeing the tens of thousands of dollars that go out to try
9 to manage the output of the use of materials and natural
10 resources, recycling of tires and alternative uses of
11 materials, \$1.5 million does not seem like a whole lot
12 within that context; but in the environmental education
13 community, it's huge. This program is renovating and we
14 have a tremendous interest in the education community on
15 this particular issue.

16 And getting the support of the State Board of
17 Education has been a big coup for us. They are positioned
18 to work with us. They're going to work us through the
19 process. We're going to go to the Curriculum Commission.
20 We're going to actually go to the State Board and get
21 their approval of our program, which means we will have --
22 we will be the only environmental education program in the
23 State that is approved by the State Board of Education.
24 So we're very, very excited. We're very pleased.

25 And I also want to say a special thanks to the

1 State and Consumer Services Agencies, because they have
2 provided us with over \$540,000 to develop all of the
3 resource materials for this project. And I truly believe
4 that this program would not be successful without their
5 support, both in terms of resources and technical support
6 on the field of energy.

7 What we will be doing -- the bill speaks in terms
8 of grant programs primarily in the field of diversion and
9 integrated waste management projects. So I just wanted to
10 speak to that real quickly and explain that we will have
11 an emphasis on integrated waste management programs at the
12 school sites.

13 However, it does also address the need to
14 integrate environmental themes and have students start
15 thinking of their community, their school community, as a
16 system, as an ecosystem in a sense, and to look at all of
17 the elements together and how they interconnect and try to
18 address all and each.

19 So based upon the limited resources we have, we
20 have identified with our consultants and the whole array
21 of stakeholders, there's been multiple state agencies
22 experts who have put input into this plan and have come up
23 with themes of waste management, energy, and water. And
24 we're working with State and Consumer Services Agency as I
25 speak on also incorporating some elements of air quality

1 as well.

2 So thank you to them for making this possible.

3 And at this point what I'll do is I'll hand the mic over
4 to Terri Gray, who will introduce part of the plan, and
5 then we'll finish up with Becky Williams from my staff.

6 Thank you.

7 MS. GRAY: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
8 Committee Member.

9 This School Deal legislation seeks to increase
10 the presence of resource management programs such as waste
11 prevention, recycling, composting, and other resource
12 management programs on school district campuses statewide.
13 As Trish said, this plan is one of the first of its kind
14 where classroom instruction and campus programs are
15 linked.

16 Based on the terms of the legislation plan
17 implementation is projected to continue through June of
18 2005 and will culminate in a report to the Legislature and
19 the Governor. The school deal is scheduled to sunset June
20 of 2007.

21 With respect to the waste reduction tools and
22 technical assistance for schools, the legislation requires
23 the Board to develop web-based models and school waste
24 reduction tools that may be used by schools, school
25 districts, county offices, and local agencies to implement

1 waste reduction programs.

2 The Board's web-based district waste reduction
3 tools were published in April of this year and include
4 such things as information regarding the environmental,
5 economic, and educational benefits of implementing waste
6 reduction programs.

7 Also strategies to reduce the solid waste
8 generated in all areas of a school district, for example,
9 in the administration offices, the classrooms, the
10 maintenance and operations, and the food service areas.

11 It can also find out estimates of how much paper,
12 glass, food and other materials that are thrown away in
13 each school district. It can access results from the
14 Board's school district survey regarding waste reduction
15 program implementation and information about other state's
16 waste reduction programs, as well as model programs in
17 California school profiles data and even more.

18 Resources which are now under development for the
19 web-based resources are: More model programs, a
20 frequently-asked-question section to answer questions like
21 "How do I obtain bins for my school?", and others that are
22 received on a regular basis.

23 We also have updated school district waste
24 reduction publications on the way.

25 These resources are being marketed through school

1 district associations like California School Board
2 Association and others, and organizations, as well as to
3 our local government partners and to our Board staff.

4 In terms of outreach, the law requires and we are
5 developing training and ongoing technical and
6 informational assistance to local agencies, offices,
7 schools, and school districts on implementing waste
8 reduction programs.

9 We are planning regional training for both school
10 districts and local governments during 2003.

11 In addition to sharing the information and tools
12 the Board offers, we see these trainings as networking
13 opportunities for districts and jurisdictions as well as
14 other important stakeholders like the haulers, the local
15 recyclers, and nonprofit organizations.

16 Facilitating partnerships in this way is
17 consistent with the part of the law encouraging school
18 district staff to coordinate with local government staff
19 to implement solid waste management programs.

20 With respect to evaluating the implementation of
21 school waste reduction programs in the State schools, the
22 Board is also required on or before January 1st of 2004 to
23 evaluate the implementation of school waste reduction and
24 recycling programs in the State schools. If the Board
25 determines that less than 75 percent of schools have

1 implemented a waste reduction and recycling program, the
2 Board shall recommend to the Legislature those statutory
3 changes needed to require schools to implement such a
4 program. That will commence in summer of 2003.

5 This concludes my portion of the presentation.
6 Unless you have questions, Becky Williams will present the
7 integrated education strategies.

8 MS. WILLIAMS: Good morning.

9 The primary education related components of the
10 school deal are the Environmental Ambassador Pilot Program
11 and the Unified Education Strategy. You're going to be
12 seeing those acronyms quite a bit over the next couple
13 years. And so we're going to introduce them to you today.

14 You'll probably also recall that the legislation
15 calls for a grant program. It's a \$1.5 million allocation
16 that will fund the grant program. And the Board has
17 decided to allot that money in over two fiscal years. The
18 first fiscal year 900,000 will be given out and the second
19 fiscal year, '03-'04, it would be 600,000.

20 The grant program that we're proposing is two
21 pronged, and it's intended to support the Environmental
22 Ambassador Pilot Program and the Unified Education
23 Strategy Program by providing grant funds to eligible and
24 selected grantees. Grant awards will provide for
25 geographic distribution, socioeconomic diversity, and

1 appropriate representation of grade levels.

2 You received a handout before the meeting. And
3 this is basically a recap of the financial and the
4 timelines that are associated with these programs. So
5 you'll be able to refer to it as we go along.

6 The first program, the Environmental Ambassador
7 Pilot Program, seeks to identify model programs that
8 integrate instruction with on-site resource programs. Our
9 main goal for the Environmental Ambassador Pilot Program
10 is to document at least five school districts, model
11 programs that are successful and replicable.

12 Having an existing program will be fundamental to
13 selecting the pilots. The environmental ambassadors must
14 want to partner with the Board, must be amenable to
15 helping the Board achieve our goals and objectives for
16 this project, and also be willing to act as mentors to
17 other school districts.

18 All potential candidates will be researched and
19 interviewed.

20 The School Deal Project team will come back to
21 the Board in November seeking your approval for the five
22 top districts that we recommend for the pilots. Based on
23 selecting five pilots, the per-pilot allotment would be
24 \$90,000, for a total of \$450,000 which is reflected on
25 this table that you have.

1 Of the 90,000, approximately 20,000 needs to be
2 earmarked by each pilot school district for professional
3 development and four site visits by the evaluation team.
4 And that's another critical element of this bill is that
5 it calls for us to report to the Legislature on the
6 results and progress of these programs. So we've really
7 taken the evaluation component as a very important
8 integral part of the plan; and it's going to be weaved in
9 and integrated into both programs from the very beginning
10 so that we can collect the data that we need along the
11 way.

12 The grantees will be provided with a one-week
13 summer institute to learn about the resources and
14 materials that will be produced for this project, as well
15 as give them an opportunity to network with one another
16 and to learn about each other's programs.

17 I will get to the resource materials in just a
18 moment and tell you about what those will be.

19 The grantees will also have two years to work
20 with the Board to produce substantive data that we will
21 then use for that 2005 report to the Legislature.

22 So that's the Environmental Ambassador Program in
23 a nutshell.

24 The next part of the program is the Unified
25 Education Strategy. And what we're proposing here is to

1 offer a competitive grant program to school districts that
2 are committed to establishing an integrated program that
3 blends the instruction with student action projects that
4 are waste diversion and resource conservation focused.
5 And as Tricia mentioned earlier, this is service learning.
6 It's really taking what's being learned traditionally in
7 the classroom and applying it to projects on campus and in
8 the communities.

9 The School Deal Project team will seek Board
10 approval for the grant criteria next month, so we'll come
11 back in October asking for your approval on that grant
12 criteria.

13 The proposed Unified Education Strategy grants
14 are designed to provide two years of funding, for
15 approximately 15 school districts. The first year funding
16 would be at the amount of approximately 27,000 per
17 district, and it would be used for training, for research,
18 and for planning by those districts. If the plan comes in
19 and we like it and it's satisfactory and it's approved by
20 the Board, the second year funding would be given to those
21 same districts at the amount of 38,000 per district for
22 implementation of the plans that they've submitted after
23 they've done their year of planning and research and
24 identified programs that they need to put into place.

25 The grant awards would then go forward to the

1 Board in May of 2003 for that first cycle, for the first
2 year of funding. These grantees will also be provided
3 with professional development training at a three-day
4 training session in the summer of 2003 to learn how to use
5 the resource materials that we're developing for the
6 project.

7 Okay. So the resource materials, what are they?
8 We've identified four types of resource materials that
9 will support, with the planning and implementation work,
10 the Unified Education Strategy grantees as well as, when
11 appropriate and applicable, the Environmental Ambassador
12 Programs.

13 The first area of resource materials are standard
14 based audit modules that encourage active student
15 participation in waste management and conservation. These
16 modules will be directly connected to the 6th grade
17 California contents standards.

18 And there are reasons for that. When we first
19 started the program -- started discussing and talking
20 about it, we wanted to do it all. We wanted to do K
21 through 12 and just we were really going to do it. And
22 quickly realized that it was unrealistic, given our
23 resource constraints and our time frames, and so we asked
24 all the stakeholders what grade level would be the best to
25 start out with. And 6th grade kept coming to the top of

1 the list for a few reasons.

2 Sixth graders still seem to be pretty
3 approachable in terms of getting involved in campus
4 activities. They're, you know, interested, they take
5 pride in the school, they're intellectually ready to do
6 service learning projects.

7 The 6th grade science standards are focused on
8 earth science, which is a really nice match for the
9 environmental themes that we want to cover. And by
10 focusing on 6th grade, this first time anyway, we'll be
11 meeting about two-thirds of the school settings in
12 California, because 6th grade either falls in elementary
13 school or middle school. So it's a nice fit there.

14 So the first resource materials would be the
15 standard based audit modules. The second set of materials
16 are three educational resource manuals that include
17 appropriate instructional practices, identification of
18 existing curricula, and background information on issues
19 relevant to environmental topics. That's basically a
20 resource guide for the teachers.

21 The third component would be technical manuals
22 that provide a lot of the information that Terri mentioned
23 that we already have on our web page for the facilities'
24 part of the program. And we've also begun working with
25 the markets division to include chips information from the

1 chips manuals and any green building information that
2 would be appropriate.

3 The fourth component is an educator's manual on
4 the EIC model. That stands for using the environment as
5 an integrated context for learning. That manual's going
6 to articulate the process for integrating environmental
7 content and issues with California's educational standards
8 and adopted textbooks, as well as managing service
9 learning opportunities and applying the EIC model to
10 classroom practice.

11 And we're working with Dr. Jerry Leiberman from
12 the State Education Environmental Round Table on that.
13 He's highly regarded, very reputable in his field, and
14 we're really excited to work with him for that component.

15 As I mentioned earlier, there will be
16 professional development training in the summer of 2003
17 for both sets of grantees. The materials will be ready at
18 that point to share with the grantees. However, we're
19 going to continue to refine and revise the materials based
20 on their feedback and input so that we'll have final
21 publications ready for distribution to all interested
22 parties by 2005.

23 It all should be noted, and Trish mentioned this
24 earlier, that all the curricular and training elements
25 will involve review by the State Board of Education,

1 California Department of Education, and the Secretary for
2 Education. And that's going to lend so much credibility
3 to our program that we've just really discovered it's a
4 really valuable partnership and we're pleased about that.

5 This plan that we're proposing is ambitious but
6 doable. It strives to bring a new level of participation
7 and commitment by California schools to the area of
8 resource management and conservation. And yet all along
9 the way we've been mindful of today's educational climate
10 in developing this plan. By providing effective schools
11 and materials, helping to build useful partnerships, and
12 showing quantifiable data on the results of our efforts,
13 we believe that we'll attract and get the attention of
14 more districts and local government with whom we can share
15 these models and information.

16 So that concludes my presentation. And we
17 welcome your questions.

18 Thank you.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you,
20 Mr. Jones. And thank you. I just want to again publicly
21 thank Trish, Terri and Becky and Pat for all of their
22 work. I know this has been a real coordinating effort.
23 And this is so exciting to me and to other Board members,
24 I'm sure. Because yesterday as I attended the dedication
25 of the Department of Education, the first building in the

1 East-End Project, as Superintendent Delaine Eastin said,
2 "Kids get it." And if we can make a start here, we -- you
3 know, it is really the most important thing, in my
4 opinion, that we can do.

5 And you guys have worked really hard, I know,
6 working with the State Department of Education, the
7 Department of Education, the Secretary of Education,
8 Senator Torlakson's office. And just -- it's been a real
9 balancing act. And I think we're off to a great start. I
10 know it's been frustrating at times for all of us, but I
11 think that we're really doing it. And I'm really, really
12 proud, and I think this program's going to make a
13 tremendous difference in everything that we do here at the
14 Board.

15 So thank you very much.

16 Oh, also I would like to publicly thank Secretary
17 Eileen Adams and Arnie Sole, who have just been terrific
18 in supporting us, as Trish said, both financially and just
19 their enthusiasm. We've had quite a few meetings with
20 them, and we really -- you know, really feel a partnership
21 there. So they've been great.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thanks, Madam Chair.

24 I also want to congratulate your team. I think
25 that this is incredibly important.

1 I think we do have to give some credit to Chair
2 Linda Moulton-Patterson and Bonnie Bruce, who worked
3 really hard with Senator Torlakson's office, and with you
4 guys to even get this thing through the Legislature. So
5 you did a nice job, and I think it is critical.

6 I'm hoping that we have -- there was -- one of
7 the bullets is coordination of development and maintenance
8 of promotion of lists of recycled materials and
9 environmentally preferable products for construction.

10 One of the things that people don't get is that
11 you can collect all this stuff all day long. And If you
12 don't have people that are going to go out and buy
13 recycled content products, this is all for nothing. So
14 hopefully there is sections in here that talk about
15 recycled content material, how these recovered products
16 can be used as a new product, and save the resources that
17 are virgin out there and start utilizing things more than
18 once. Because without it -- without that kind of
19 educational understanding, this becomes all for nothing.

20 So I don't mean your program. I mean everything
21 we've done and the investment that's been made. So you
22 have an incredible opportunity. But I just -- I hope you
23 don't lose site of that because I think that is, without a
24 doubt, the most important piece.

25 MS. BRODDRICK: And you're correct, Mr. Jones,

1 because there is an element in the bill that does speak to
2 that. And we are working with the Office of the State
3 Architect and we are assisting them in putting together a
4 database of sources of those types of materials. So that
5 when we do go to these districts and we speak to that
6 issue directly, they actually have a resource to access to
7 get that information and to follow-up on it.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And then the kids will get it
9 on paper and cans and all that good --

10 MS. BRODDRICK: That's right.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: And I do have to at least
12 encourage-- Trish has been there. But you're looking for
13 models. And there is a good model in Tuolumne County, I
14 know. And it is an interactive service learning basis
15 program. They get to do a little math, they get to do a
16 little English, they get to do a little -- and it covers
17 all of it. So take a look at it.

18 MS. BRODDRICK: It's also cross-curricular. They
19 speak to energy and other environmental themes.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Absolutely.

21 MS. BRODDRICK: And that's what we're trying to
22 do.

23 And one of the things we haven't emphasized in
24 the implementation of this plan is the fact that we are
25 working with multiple state agencies who will be a part of

1 our team to assist these districts in setting up energy
2 conservation programs. And they'll speak to storm water.
3 We're working with Special Waste Deputy Director Shirley
4 Willd-Wagner. We also have a whole array of contacts and
5 partners over at the Resources Agency who have been
6 intricately involved in this. There's a whole team behind
7 this and we're all working together, and this is
8 definitely a model for unified education.

9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Right, I agree. So take a
10 look at Tuolumne, too, when you look at number 5.

11 MS. BRODDRICK: And we're the leader in that.
12 And thank you on your leadership.

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We're going to have to hold
14 on the vote for a little bit, but I think it's getting
15 closer because I see the people and the books. So we're
16 getting a little bit closer.

17 Does anybody have any questions on this thing
18 other than the two Board members?

19 Okay. I hate stalling. But I think what we will
20 probably do is take a couple minute break. We'll take
21 about -- you guys can't go away because we've still got to
22 vote on this thing.

23 We're going to take about a 5 to 10 minute break
24 so that we can move on, and then we'll be back.

25 Thanks.

1 (Thereupon a brief recess was taken.)

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We're going to
3 continue.

4 Mr. Medina, I knew you had another meeting and
5 had to come back. We appreciate that.

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Glad I could help.

7 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Would you show that Mr.
8 Medina is here.

9 We heard a -- Mr. Medina, any ex partes?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: None to report.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

12 We just heard an exciting item Number B, which
13 would be 2 in our agenda: Consideration of the
14 implementation plan of the School Diversion and
15 Environmental Education Law, SB 373, that laid out an
16 aggressive, good, cooperative plan with a lot of agencies.
17 And if there are no questions, we are just about ready to
18 make a motion.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: And, Mr.
20 Jones, I'd like to make that motion, to approve Resolution
21 2002-528, for the implementation plan for the School
22 Diversion and Environmental Education Law, SB 373.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to second that
24 motion.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We have a motion by Linda

1 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

2 Could you call the roll?

3 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Medina?

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Aye.

5 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Moulton-Patterson?

6 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Aye.

7 SECRETARY BAKULICH: Jones?

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Aye.

9 Consent?

10 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes.

11 This will be on consent.

12 Thank you very much. You guys did a great job.

13 Keep banging away.

14 All right. Just for the record, Item Number 4,

15 which is Marin -- it's AB 75 -- has been pulled. They
16 turned it in just in the nick of time.

17 And Item Number AD, which would be 40, I think,

18 La Puente -- or 30, I'm sorry -- La Puente has been
19 pulled, just so people know.

20 All right. Mr. Schiavo.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Can I add to that list?

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: You certainly can.

23 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item Number 29,
24 they have gotten their information into us.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Which is letter -- let

1 me see.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: -- which is letter AC,
3 air-conditioning.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay, good. So that's been
5 pulled.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. We have a
7 conflict on -- yours says AD?

8 Oh, mine says AC.

9 It's Eureka, Number 29. I'm not sure what your
10 package says.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mine says AC.

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: AC. That's what mine
13 shows.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Any others?

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We'll double check it
16 as --

17 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We know Eureka. Eureka
18 works. Okay?

19 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay.

20 Any others?

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: No.

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: No.

23 All right, Mr. Schiavo.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item Number 5 is
25 consideration of staff recommendation on the 1999-2000

1 biennial review findings for the source reduction and
2 recycling element and household hazardous waste element
3 for two jurisdictions.

4 And Tabetha Willmon will be making this
5 presentation.

6 MS. WILLMON: Good morning. Item E presents to
7 the Committee for its consideration Board staff's biennial
8 review findings for the 1999-2000 biennial review period.
9 Staff have conducted the biennial review and found that
10 these jurisdictions have achieved a 2000 diversion rate of
11 at least 50 percent and are adequately implementing source
12 reduction, recycling, composting, public education and
13 information programs as outlined in their source reduction
14 and recycling elements and their household hazardous waste
15 elements.

16 Upon review, staff analysis indicates that both
17 of these jurisdictions in this item show greater than 5
18 percent change from 1999 to 2000. Details of these
19 jurisdictions can be found in Attachment 2.

20 This item lists those jurisdictions for which
21 staff is recommending approval of the 1999-2000 biennial
22 view. Should the Board not accept staff's recommendation,
23 these jurisdictions have reserved the right to -- in their
24 2000 annual report to submit an SB 1066 time extension
25 request.

1 This concludes my presentation.

2 Both Board staff and representatives for the
3 jurisdictions are available to answer any questions.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions, members?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: No. I'd
6 like to move Resolution 2002-500.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion and a
9 second?

10 Substitute the previous roll?

11 Put it on consent?

12 So done.

13 All right. Next.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 6, Committee F, is
15 consideration of amended nondisposal facility element for
16 the Merced County Solid Waste Regional Agency.

17 And Cedar Kehoe will be making this presentation.

18 MS. KEHOE: Good morning.

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Good morning.

20 MS. KEHOE: The Merced County Solid Waste
21 Regional Agency has amended their nondisposal facility
22 element to identify and describe the Billy Wright
23 Composting Facility, a new composting facility operating,
24 and it will be located within the permanent boundaries of
25 the Billy Wright Landfill.

1 The Board concurred in the issuance of a Solid
2 Waste Facilities Permit for the Billy Wright Landfill, the
3 most recent permit issue date of January 2001. This is
4 the regional agency's second nondisposal facility element
5 update.

6 The regional agency has submitted all the
7 required documentation and Board staff, therefore,
8 recommends approval of the regional agency's amended NDFE.

9 This concludes my presentation.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Cedar.

11 Questions?

12 Motion?

13 Mr. Medina.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, I would like to
15 move Resolution 2002-501, the amended nondisposal facility
16 element for the Merced County solid Waste Regional Agency.

17 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll second
18 that.

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion and a
20 second.

21 Substitute the previous roll?

22 On consent?

23 Thank you very much.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Items 7 through
25 11 or G through K are consideration of the application for

1 an SB 1066 time extension by the cities of La Canada
2 Flintridge, Duarte, City of Artesia, City of Hawaiian
3 Gardens, and the City of Pasadena, all in Los Angeles
4 County.

5 And Steve Uselton will be making this
6 presentation.

7 MR. USELTON: Good morning, Committee Members.

8 The cities of La Canada Flintridge, Duarte,
9 Artesia, Hawaiian Gardens, and Pasadena have requested an
10 extension through December 31st of 2003.

11 The reason that these jurisdictions need a time
12 extension is to implement the following expanded or new
13 programs:

14 In the case of La Canada Flintridge, the City
15 needs time to implement and monitor an expanded curbside
16 recycling and new green waste collection program. They
17 will be implementing economic incentives to encourage
18 recycling into the commercial rate structure. And haulers
19 will be paying a sliding permit fee based on the diversion
20 rate that they achieve with their accounts.

21 And beginning in January 2001, a new C&D
22 ordinance on building and demolition contractors now
23 requires 50 percent diversion for larger projects.

24 In the case of Duarte, there will be direct
25 technical assistance with the City's top 10 generators,

1 including financial support to receive expanded commercial
2 programs. There is an enactment of a construction and
3 demolition ordinance requiring 25 percent diversion from
4 large construction and demolition projects. And there
5 will be work with the franchise hauler to improve route
6 designs to minimize misallocations that occur with
7 neighboring cities serviced by the same hauler.

8 In the case of Artesia, the City has a new
9 automated residential curbside and green waste collection
10 program that began in December of 2001. They are now
11 routing all commercial refuse through a full MERF sort.
12 There's been an adoption of an ordinance requiring 50
13 percent diversion from larger construction and demolition
14 projects with a reporting element. There is an expanded
15 public education program with additional emphasis on
16 bilingual communication.

17 In the case of Hawaiian Gardens, the City has
18 expanded their container capacity for the residential
19 curbside collection program. They have implemented a new
20 monthly residential drop-off program with their hauler for
21 bulky items, metals, woods, concrete, asphalt, tires, and
22 cleanup debris. And staff did look at the records of how
23 much material was being collected through this program,
24 and it's been extremely successful.

25 The city is also putting in a C&D ordinance that

1 became effective in the year 2000 that now requires
2 building project applicants to divert 50 percent of their
3 construction wastes. And there's an expanded public
4 education program, again with more emphasis on bilingual
5 communication.

6 In the case of Pasadena, the City has decided to
7 reinstitute community newspaper and cardboard drop-off
8 locations to support additional diversion from the
9 multi-family sector. The city has also expanded their
10 hauler requirements. In this case there are 43
11 nonexclusive commercial haulers that are now required to
12 have a plan of action for achieving 50 percent diversion.
13 For those haulers that are having trouble in meeting that
14 goal, the City will work directly with them to provide
15 options for them to meet the goal or somehow make it
16 better.

17 The city will also have some new recycling and
18 public education at large venues, such as the Rose Bowl.
19 And I was honored to participate with the City in a
20 project that they did with the Rose Bowl. And there was a
21 lot of interest and so many people came up to talk to the
22 City about their programs. It was very successful.

23 The programs listed in the jurisdictions' plan of
24 correction and the respective anticipated percent increase
25 in diversion rates are provided in the table included in

1 each of these jurisdictions' respective agenda items.

2 Board staff has determined that the information
3 submitted in all the applications is adequately
4 documented. And based on this information Board staff is
5 recommending that the Board approve the time extension
6 requests for these jurisdictions.

7 Representatives from the jurisdictions are
8 available to answer questions.

9 And that would conclude my presentation.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Are there any
11 questions? Because I have one.

12 No?

13 The City of Hawaiian Gardens would have been at
14 54 percent without that disposal of inert material at
15 those permitted sites. Have they taken advantage of
16 identifying what C&D sites created that so that they could
17 come and get the waiver which this Board put in place
18 about a year and a half ago, I think, right?

19 MR. USELTON: Exactly. We did work directly with
20 the City to see if that opportunity could present itself.
21 The City obtained the hauler records -- or I'm sorry --
22 the landfill records for those permitted inert sites. The
23 spike was related to a new shopping center deconstruction
24 and then putting up a new facility.

25 This project was under the control of the

1 jurisdiction. One of the things in this plan of
2 correction in order to prevent this from happening in the
3 future is to now require that these types of projects turn
4 in a plan ahead of their -- when they're applying for
5 their permit.

6 So that's really the bulk of what this plan of
7 correction addresses.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. But they still have an
9 option now before they come in front of us for the
10 biennial review to deal with the -- at least talking about
11 the waiver issue, right?

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yeah, they have an
13 opportunity to meet some criteria. One is identifying the
14 projects. And the other is they'd need to identify to us
15 that they have programs to mitigate those impacts.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Right. It may not be
17 perfect. But I just think with as much discussion as
18 we've had about the inert sites, we -- because Hawaiian
19 Gardens has gone in leaps and bounds doing a fantastic job
20 compared to what it was a few years ago. And I hate to
21 see them get penalized -- not penalized, but, you know,
22 there are some options there that they need to be aware
23 of.

24 And then on Duarte, when they're talking about
25 their routing and stuff, give me a call because there are

1 some ideas we gave forward to the L.A. area that might
2 mean they don't have to just drive down the border of the
3 street. Just deals with allocating waste to specific
4 trucks.

5 MR. USELTON: Okay.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: So give me a call and I'll
7 give you an idea.

8 Members, motions?

9 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Yes. I'd be
10 glad to make a motion. Can we make it all in one motion,
11 or would you like separate ones, Mr. Block?

12 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: You could do one motion.
13 Just be sure to list all of the resolutions.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I will.

15 Okay. Thank you.

16 With that I will move approval for time
17 extension, SB 1066, for the City of La Canada, which is
18 Resolution 2002-504.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

20 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: And also the
21 City of Duarte. I can't put my fingers on that.

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: 2002-505.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second on that one.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

1 And time extension for the City of Artesia, which
2 is 2002-506.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second on that one.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

5 And a time extension for the City of Hawaiian
6 Gardens, and that's Resolution 2002-507.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second on that one.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Thank you.

9 And for the City of Pasadena, lastly, which is
10 2002-508.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second on that one.

12 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion and a
13 second. Substitute the previous roll?

14 On consent?

15 So done.

16 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item Number 12,
17 Committee Item L, is consideration of the application for
18 an SB 1066 time extension by the County of San Diego.

19 And Melissa Vargas will be making this
20 presentation.

21 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Chairman Jones
22 Committee members.

23 San Diego County is requesting an extension
24 through August 31st, 2004. The County identified several
25 factors that have contributed to the county not achieving

1 the 50-percent goal, and has incorporated these areas into
2 their program enhancements.

3 The specific reasons the county needs a time
4 extension are as follows:

5 Low participation rate from businesses and
6 schools. The County has a new recycling coordinator, who
7 will be working to conduct business and school surveys and
8 to provide outreach services.

9 The County has experienced a number of
10 construction and demolition projects that have impacted
11 their waste stream. The County will expand their current
12 C&D programs to include changes in their general plan,
13 zoning, revision to their ordinance, interjurisdictional
14 coordination, and possibly new C&D facilities.

15 The County will require that curbside service be
16 provided by the haulers to all customers. The County will
17 also implement block leader program to increase
18 participation in curbside programs for multi-families.

19 Possible misallocation of tonnage generated from
20 other cities and/or CalTrans. The County will be
21 researching their tonnage reporting system for possible
22 errors. Once these errors are identified, the county will
23 develop and implement solutions to these errors.

24 The programs listed in the plan of correction are
25 detailed in page -- on Pages 12 through 15 through 12

1 through 17 of your binder. The County anticipates a
2 6-percent increase.

3 Board staff has determined that the information
4 submitted in the application is adequately documented.
5 Based on this information Board staff is recommending that
6 the Board approve the County's time extension request.

7 This concludes my presentation.

8 Representatives of the county are available to
9 answer your questions.

10 Thank you.

11 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

12 Members, questions?

13 Motion?

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Okay. I'd
15 like to move approval of the resolution 2002-590 for a
16 1066 time extension for the unincorporated San Diego
17 County.

18 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

19 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion on
20 Resolution 2002-509, and a second.

21 Substitute the previous roll.

22 And put it on consent?

23 Okay. So done.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 13, Committee Item
25 M, is consideration of the application for an SB 1066

1 alternative diversion requirement for the City of Galt in
2 Sacramento County.

3 And Kyle Pogue will be making this presentation.

4 MR. POGUE: Good morning, Committee Members.

5 Kyle Pogue, Office of Local Assistance.

6 The City of Galt has requested an SB 1066
7 alternative diversion requirement, or ADR, of 48 percent
8 through December 31st, 2003. The specific reasons why
9 Galt is requesting an ADR are as follows:

10 The city needs additional time to implement a
11 multi-family recycling program and expand its commercial
12 recycling program. The city is dissatisfied with its
13 diversion measurement and needs additional time to ensure
14 accuracy.

15 The city is requesting an ADR instead of a time
16 extension because they could not project higher diversion
17 percentages to the 50-percent goal.

18 The programs listed in Galt's goal-achievement
19 plan are on Page 13-15 of your binder. Galt anticipates
20 achieving a 48-percent diversion rate by December 31st,
21 2003. That's a 7-percent increase over its current 2000
22 diversion rate.

23 Board staff determined that the information
24 submitted in the City's application is adequately
25 documented. Based on this information, Board staff is

1 recommending that the Board approve the ADR requested by
2 the City.

3 City representatives are available if you have
4 any questions.

5 And that concludes my presentation.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I have one question.

7 The new resolution that we got, we don't have to
8 call that revised do we? It doesn't say -- that becomes
9 the new one, right?

10 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: You should probably refer
11 to it in the motion as the corrected one. It looks like
12 the only change was to put the correct Board meeting date
13 on the bottom.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Madam Chair.

15 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to
16 move Resolution 2002-510 revised. And this is for SB 1066
17 alternative diversion requirement by the City of Galt,
18 Sacramento county.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I second the motion.

20 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Linda
21 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

22 Substitute the previous roll?

23 On consent?

24 Thank you.

25 Next.

1 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Number 14, Committee
2 Item N, is consideration of an application for an SB 1066
3 time extension by the City of Upland, San Bernardino
4 County.

5 And Tabetha Willmon will be making this
6 presentation.

7 MS. WILLMON: Good morning again.

8 The City of Upland has requested an extension
9 through June 30th, 2003. The specific reason the City
10 needs a time extension is as follows:

11 The city negotiated a new contract which was
12 effective May of 2001 that included expansions to its
13 diversion programs. The city would like to have until
14 2003 to evaluate the effectiveness of the contract,
15 determine the results of the programs included in the
16 contract, determine if the performance guarantees are
17 being met, and, if necessary, make any modifications to
18 accomplish their goals.

19 The programs listed in the plan of correction are
20 on Page 14-3 of your binder. The city anticipates an 11
21 percent increase in their diversion rate.

22 Board staff has determined that the information
23 submitted in the application is adequately documented, and
24 based this information Board staff is recommending that
25 the Board approve the time extension request for the City.

1 And we do have a representative from the City
2 present to answer any questions.

3 This concludes my presentation. Thank you.

4 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Tabetha.

5 Any questions?

6 Motion?

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Mr. Chair, I'd like to
8 move Resolution 2002-511, application for an SB 1066 time
9 extension by the City of Upland, San Bernardino County.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll second
12 that.

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Mr. Medina,
14 second by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson.

15 Substitute the previous roll?

16 Put it on consent?

17 So done.

18 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Items 17 and 18, Q and
19 R, are consideration of the application for SB 1066 time
20 extensions by the City of San Carlos and the City of San
21 Mateo in San Mateo County.

22 And Keir Furey will be making this presentation.

23 MR. FUREY: Good morning, Committee Members.

24 The city of San Carlos and the City of San Mateo
25 have each submitted a request for a time extension through

1 December 31, 2003. The diversion rate for San Carlos is
2 42 percent and for San Mateo is 39 percent.

3 The specific reason these cities have a need for
4 a time extension are as follows:

5 The City of San Carlos and the City of San Mateo
6 have both stated that their principal barrier was failure
7 to recognize that their cities' existing programs as
8 currently implemented will not achieve the 50 percent
9 goal.

10 The cities had already targeted a broad range of
11 waste stream sectors, so no large single component was
12 still available for new focus. Both of the cities plan to
13 expand participation in existing programs that have
14 already targeted significant sectors of the waste stream.
15 This will require an intensive outreach campaign, meeting
16 with individual businesses, multi-family complexes,
17 working with building contractors, which will involve a
18 significant amount of time.

19 In addition, each city will implement new uniform
20 or progressive rate structures for commercial and
21 residential disposal. This will create financial
22 incentives for increasing diversion.

23 The programs listed in the plan of correction are
24 on page 17-3 and 183 of your binder.

25 San Carlos anticipates a 19.8 percent increase in

1 its diversion. San Mateo anticipates an 18.3 percent
2 increase in its diversion rate.

3 Board staff has determined that the information
4 submitted in the applications is adequately documented.
5 Based on this information, Board staff recommends that the
6 Board approve the time extension requests for the City of
7 San Carlos and the City of San Mateo.

8 That concludes my presentation.

9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you, Keir.

10 Mr. Medina.

11 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like
12 to move Resolution 2002-514, 1066 time extension for the
13 City of San Carlos, San Mateo County.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I will
15 second that.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion and a second for
17 the City of San Carlos' time extension.

18 Substitute the previous roll?

19 And put it on consent?

20 So done.

21 Mr. Medina.

22 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: I'd like to move
23 Resolution 2002-515, 1066 time extension for the City of
24 San Mateo, San Mateo County.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Mr. Medina,
2 second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

3 Substitute the previous roll?

4 And put on it consent?

5 Thank you.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item Number 19, S, is
7 consideration of 1999-2000 biennial review findings for
8 the source reduction and recycling element and household
9 hazardous waste element for the unincorporated area of
10 Santa Cruz County.

11 And Terri Edwards will make this presentation.

12 MS. EDWARDS: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
13 Committee Members.

14 Staff conducted a 1999-2000 biennial review for
15 the unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County and found
16 that the jurisdiction has adequately implemented source
17 reduction, recycling, composting, public education, and
18 information programs as outlined in their source reduction
19 and recycling element and household hazardous waste
20 element.

21 In addition, staff found that this jurisdiction
22 has achieved a 2000 diversion rate of at least 50 percent
23 including no more than 10 percent diversion from biomass.

24 As described in the item, the jurisdiction's 2000
25 rate would change from 45-percent diversion without

1 biomass to 50-percent diversion with biomass.

2 In addition staff conducted a site visit in 2002
3 and verified that the jurisdiction's diversion program
4 implementation is solid in its foundation and
5 effectiveness, which is the basis for staff's
6 recommendation.

7 Should the Board not accept staff's
8 recommendation, this jurisdiction has reserved the right
9 in their 2000 annual report to submit an SB 1066 time
10 extension request.

11 Because this jurisdiction has demonstrated that
12 they are adequately implementing their SRRE and HHWE, met
13 the 50-percent diversion requirement and have documented
14 that they meet the conditions for claiming biomass
15 diversion in 2000, staff recommends the Board approve
16 staff's biennial review findings for this jurisdiction and
17 the biomass diversion claim.

18 A representative from the Santa Cruz
19 unincorporated area is present to answer any questions.

20 This concludes my presentation.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

22 Questions?

23 Mr. Medina.

24 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Mr. Chair, I'd like to
25 move Resolution 2002-516 approving the 1999-2000 biennial

1 review findings for the source reduction and recycling
2 element and household hazardous waste element for the
3 unincorporated area of Santa Cruz County.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

5 CHAIRPESON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
6 Medina, second by Linda Moulton-Patterson.

7 Substitute the previous roll?

8 And on consent?

9 Thank you, members.

10 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item 20 is
11 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings
12 for the unincorporated area of Placer County.

13 And Kyle Pogue will make this presentation.

14 MR. POGUE: Hello again. Kyle Pogue, Office of
15 Local Assistance.

16 Staff conducted a 1999-2000 biennial review of
17 the unincorporated area of Placer County and finds that
18 the county is adequately implementing source reduction,
19 recycling, composting, and a public education and
20 information programs.

21 The County is claiming biomass diversion credit
22 of 12,321 tons, which raises the County's diversion rate
23 from 44 percent to 52 percent. Because this jurisdiction
24 has demonstrated it is adequately implementing a SRRE and
25 HHWE and has met the 50-percent diversion requirement and

1 has documented that it meets the conditions for claiming
2 biomass diversion in 2000, staff recommends the Board
3 approve staff's biennial review findings for the
4 unincorporated area of Placer County.

5 This concludes my presentation.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Any questions?

7 If there aren't any, I think this time I want to
8 make the motion. I did a little bit of work in that
9 county, put in some of those programs.

10 So if nobody minds, I'll move adoption of
11 Resolution 2002-517, the consideration of the biennial
12 review finding and source reduction and recycling element
13 and HHWE for the unincorporated area of Placer County.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Jones, second
16 by Chair Linda Moulton-Patterson.

17 Substitute the previous roll?

18 On consent?

19 Thank you.

20 Next.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 21 is
22 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings
23 for the City of Laguna Beach in Orange County.

24 And Melissa Vargas will be making this
25 presentation.

1 MS. VARGAS: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
2 Committee Members.

3 The City of Laguna Beach's diversion rate for
4 1999 is 49 percent and for 2000 is 45 percent. To
5 determine the level of source reduction and recycling
6 element and household hazardous waste element
7 implementation staff analyzed the historic diversion rate
8 trend which has consistently been at or over 40 percent
9 for 1998, 1999 and 2000; and conducted a site visit --
10 program verification site visit in 2002.

11 Both the jurisdiction's programs and staff
12 analysis of these programs can be found in detail on Page
13 21-3 and 21-4 of your binder.

14 Some of the major programs that have been
15 implemented include residential curbside recycling and
16 green waste programs; commercial recycling programs;
17 economic incentives; government source reduction,
18 recycling, and composting programs.

19 Because this jurisdiction is adequately
20 implementing its SRRE and HHWE, staff recommends the Board
21 find that Laguna Beach has made a good faith effort in
22 meeting diversion requirements.

23 This concludes my presentation.

24 A representative from Laguna beach is present to
25 answer questions.

1 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

2 Madam Chair.

3 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to
4 move Resolution 2002-518 for the City of Laguna Beach.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Chair
7 Linda Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

8 Substitute the previous roll?

9 On consent?

10 So ordered.

11 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item Number 22
12 is consideration of a request to change the base year to
13 2000 in consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review
14 findings for the unincorporated area of Yolo County.

15 And Carolyn Sullivan will be making this
16 presentation.

17 MS. SULLIVAN: Good morning.

18 The County of Yolo submitted a request to change
19 its base year from 1990 to 2000. The County originally
20 submitted a new base-year-change request with a diversion
21 rate of 60 percent for 2000. No extrapolation was used to
22 calculate diversion.

23 As part of the base-year-study review Board staff
24 conducted a detailed site visit. Board staff proposed
25 changes can be seen in their entirety in Attachment 3.

1 With these changes the County's diversion rate
2 for 2000 would be 65 percent, thus exceeding the
3 50-percent diversion goal for 2000.

4 Staff also conducted a review of the County's
5 diversion programs. The County has reported that they
6 have successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
7 composting, and public education programs to meet the
8 50-percent diversion goal.

9 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the
10 agenda item, which would approve the revised new base year
11 with staff recommendations and accept the 1999-2000
12 biennial review findings.

13 Representatives from the county are present to
14 answer any questions.

15 This concludes my presentation.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I know Yvonne Hunter really
17 wanted this one done before we went down to the League of
18 Cities in Monterey.

19 Congratulations, both to the staff of Yolo County
20 and to you guys. I mean they came up with a lot of
21 diversion and you guys ended up finding another 10,000
22 tons of legitimate diversion because it doesn't always go
23 the other way. I mean we've seen a lot of these where you
24 guys have actually found more legitimate diversion
25 activity and increased diversion rates, and that's very

1 refreshing, I know, for all the members, instead of always
2 fighting about 800 pound pallets.

3 Who would like to make -- Mr. Medina.

4 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes, I want to move
5 this. I just wanted to make certain that Resolution
6 2002-519 reflected Option 2.

7 If it does, then I will go ahead and move
8 Resolution 2002-519, approval of changing the base year to
9 2000 for the previously approved source reduction and
10 recycling element consideration of the '99-2000 biennial
11 review findings for the source reduction and recycling
12 element and household hazardous waste element for the
13 unincorporated area of Yolo County.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We got a motion by Mr.
16 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

17 Substitute the previous roll?

18 On consent?

19 So ordered.

20 Next.

21 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Okay. Item Number 23
22 is consideration of a request to change the base year to
23 1999 for the City of Pleasant Hill in Contra Costa County.

24 And I just want to mention that this item was
25 incorrectly titled in the Committee packet. It's correct

1 in the Board packet. And according to legal staff, that
2 we've met the public noticing requirements, we're
3 technically okay to this. But I just want to bring that
4 to your attention.

5 STAFF COUNSEL BLOCK: Just for the record, we
6 essentially overnoticed for the Committee meeting. So we
7 noticed more than we're in fact going to do, so that's why
8 it's okay.

9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. So Eric Bissinger will
10 be making this presentation.

11 MR. BISSINGER: Good morning. I'm Eric Bissinger
12 with the Office of Local Assistance.

13 The City of Pleasant Hill submitted a request to
14 change their base year from 1990 to 1999. The City of
15 Pleasant Hill originally submitted a new base year change
16 request with a diversion rate of 41 percent for 1999.

17 As part of the base-year-study review Board staff
18 conducted a detailed site visit. Changes proposed by
19 Board staff can be seen in their entirety in each -- in
20 the Attachment 3. With these changes Pleasant Hill's
21 diversion rate for 1999 would be 29 percent.

22 The major programs that the jurisdiction has
23 implemented are a curbside recycling collection program,
24 business waste diversion, and inert recycling.

25 Board staff is recommending Option 2 of the

1 agenda item, which would approve the revised new base year
2 with staff recommendations.

3 A representative from the jurisdiction is present
4 to answer any questions.

5 And this concludes my presentation.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. We do have a speaker
7 slip on this.

8 This was really -- the only one I saw was that
9 there was just one item that was not in the City limits
10 that really took a lot of the tonnage away, right? I mean
11 so this was just a boundary.

12 MR. BISSINGER: Yeah, but it's a business that
13 takes materials from all over the place. So the material
14 wasn't generated in the City of Pleasant Hill, so --

15 CHAIRPERSON JONES: So, I mean it's -- because
16 Mr. White does a good job. And when I was going through
17 this I noticed that it was a boundary issue and not a
18 multiplication issue.

19 Mr. White, "I wish to speak only if needed."

20 Okay. Who wants to make a motion?

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'll make
22 it. I'd like to move approval of Resolution 2002-520.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Chair
25 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

1 Substitute the previous roll?

2 So done.

3 Put it on consent?

4 So done.

5 All right. Thank you.

6 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Items 24 and 25 are
7 consideration of requests to change base years to 1997 and
8 consideration of 1997-'98 to 1999-2000 biennial review
9 findings for the cities of Ukiah and Willits, both in
10 Mendocino County.

11 And Betty Fernandez will make this presentation.

12 MS. FERNANDEZ: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
13 Committee Members.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: You haven't been here too
15 many times.

16 MS. FERNANDEZ: Can you tell?

17 The City of Willits and the City of Ukiah
18 originally submitted new base-year-change requests with
19 diversion rates of 33 percent and 37 percent respectively.

20 As part of base-year-study review Board staff
21 conducted a detailed site visit. Inaccuracies of
22 estimates of both residential and nonresidential diversion
23 programs were discovered.

24 Board staff recommended changes can be reviewed
25 in their entirety by referring to Attachment 3 of the

1 agenda item packet.

2 As a result of these differences Board staff
3 recommends revised diversion rates of 38 percent for
4 Willits and 42 percent for Ukiah, for the base year of
5 1997.

6 Board staff has determined that the information
7 is adequately documented.

8 The City of Willits' diversion rate for 1999 is
9 47 percent and for 2000 is 49 percent. The City of
10 Ukiah's diversion rate for 1999 is 41 percent and for 2000
11 is 48 percent.

12 To determine the level of source reduction and
13 recycling element and household hazardous waste element
14 implementation staff, first, analyzed the historic
15 diversion rate trends, which have been trending upward
16 near 50 percent in the last two years after their new base
17 year in 1997 and, second, conducted a program verification
18 site visit in 2002.

19 Both jurisdictions' program and staff analysis of
20 these programs can be found in detail on Page 24-6 for
21 Ukiah and Page 25-4 for Willits of your binder.

22 Some of the major programs that have been
23 implemented for both the City of Willits and Ukiah include
24 residential curbside collection, residential curbside
25 green waste, and commercial on-site collection programs.

1 In addition, the City has implemented through a
2 contract with the Mendocino Solid Waste Management
3 Authority several programs, including: Educational school
4 programs designed to promote increased diversion efforts
5 by school districts; outreach programs such as waste
6 audits developed to educate governmental agencies on
7 recycling options; and a mobile collection program like
8 the haz-mobile and drop-off services with a transfer
9 station to recycle oil filters, oil, CRTs and vehicle
10 batteries.

11 Based on this information Board staff is
12 recommending Option 2 of the agenda item, which would
13 approve the revised new base year with staff
14 recommendation, recommended modifications, and find that
15 the City of Willits and the City of Ukiah have made good
16 faith efforts in meeting diversion requirements.

17 This concludes my presentation.

18 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Questions?

19 And these resolutions reflect Option 2?

20 MS. FERNANDEZ: Yes.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. Nice job.

22 Mr. Medina.

23 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Chair Jones, I'd like
24 to move Resolution 2002-521, changing the base year to
25 1997 for the previously approved source reduction and

1 recycling element consideration of the '97-98, '99-2000
2 biennial review findings for the source reduction and
3 recycling element and household hazardous waste element
4 for the City of Ukiah, Mendocino County.

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.
7 Medina, second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

8 Substitute the previous roll?

9 Put it on consent?

10 So done.

11 And on the next item, which would be Willits.

12 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item 26 -- oh, sorry.

13 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Well, we have to do Willits.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: I jumped ahead. I'm
15 sorry.

16 CHAIRPERSON JONES: So that would be -- which we
17 just heard that discussion on -- that would be 522.

18 Mr. Medina.

19 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Mr. Chair, I'd like to
20 move Resolution 2002-522, changing the base year to 1997
21 for the previously approved source reduction recycling
22 element and consideration of the '97-'98 and '99-2000
23 biennial review findings for the source reduction and
24 recycling element and household hazardous waste element
25 for the City of Willits, Mendocino County.

1 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

2 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Mr.

3 Medina, a second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

4 Substitute the previous roll?

5 On consent?

6 Thank you.

7 Mr. Schiavo.

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Now, okay.

9 Item 26 is a consideration of a request to change
10 the base year to 2000 and consideration 1999-2000 biennial
11 review findings for the City of Solvang, Santa Barbara
12 County.

13 And Nikki Mizwinski will make this presentation.

14 MS. MIZWINSKI: Good morning, Mr. Chair,
15 Committee Members.

16 There is a change in the Attachment 3. In fact,
17 there are two Attachment 3s that you have in your binder.
18 The only one that is of any use is the one that starts
19 with "MERF" and ends with "ADC". It should be a two-page
20 document.

21 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Okay. MERF --

22 MS. MIZWINSKI: -- and ADC. The other one is not
23 for this agenda item.

24 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Oh. Okay.

25 The City of Solvang submitted a request to change

1 their base year from 1990 to the year 2000. The city
2 originally submitted a new base-year-change request with a
3 diversion rate of 59 percent for the year 2000. As part
4 of the base-year-study review, Board staff conducted a
5 detailed site visit.

6 Board staff proposed changes can be seen in their
7 entirety in Attachment 3.

8 With these changes, the City's diversion rate for
9 the year 2000 would be 56 percent. And that would meet
10 the 50-percent diversion rate for the year 2000.

11 Staff also conducted a review of the City's
12 diversion programs. The city has reported that they have
13 successfully implemented source reduction, recycling,
14 composting, public education programs to meet its
15 50-percent diversion goal.

16 Board staff is recommending Option Number 2 of
17 the agenda item, which would approve the revised new base
18 year with new staff -- with staff recommendations, and
19 accept the 1999-2000 biennial review findings.

20 Representatives from the City are here to answer
21 any questions.

22 And this concludes my presentation.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thank you.

24 Madam Chair.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to

1 move Resolution 2002-523, request to change base year to
2 2000 for the previously approved source reduction and
3 recycling element, and consideration of the 1999-2000
4 biennial review for the source reduction and recycling
5 element and household hazardous waste element for the City
6 of Solvang, Santa Barbara County.

7 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

8 CHAIRPERSON JONES: We've got a motion by Chair
9 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

10 Substitute the previous roll?

11 Put it on consent?

12 Thank you, members.

13 Next item.

14 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Twenty-seven is
15 consideration of staff recommendation to change the base
16 year to 1998 and for consideration of the 1997-1998 and
17 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the City of San
18 Fernando in Los Angeles County.

19 And Zane Paulson will make this presentation.

20 MR. PAULSON: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
21 Committee Members.

22 The City of San Fernando has completed and
23 submitted a new waste generation study with the intent of
24 establishing a new more recent and more accurate base
25 year.

1 The city originally submitted a new
2 base-year-change request with a diversion rate of 38
3 percent for 1998. As part of the base-year-study review
4 Board staff conducted a detailed site visit.

5 Board staff's proposed changes can be seen in
6 their entirety in Attachment 3.

7 With these changes the City's diversion rate for
8 1998 would be 31 percent. Using the staff-recommended
9 changes to the base year and the adjustment factor method,
10 the City's diversion rate for 1999 is 42 percent and for
11 2000 is 46 percent.

12 To determine the level of source reduction and
13 recycling element and household hazardous waste element
14 implementation staff analyzed the historic diversion rate
15 trend which has been trending upward from 1998 to 2000 in
16 conjunction with the increased level of the program
17 implementation and conducted a program verification site
18 visit in 2002.

19 Both the jurisdiction's programs and staff
20 analysis of these programs can be found in detail on Pages
21 27-2 and 27-3 of your binder.

22 Some of the major programs that have been
23 implemented include residential curbside collection,
24 residential curbside green waste, and the use of a
25 material recovery facility to process and sort over 70

1 percent of the City's nonresidential waste.

2 In addition, the City has implemented educational
3 programs such as city newsletter articles, brochures, and
4 bill inserts and outreach to businesses.

5 The city has reported the increase to the
6 1999-2000 diversion rates correspond to increased
7 implementation of diversion program.

8 The city has also signed a new exclusive
9 collection agreement that includes semi-automated curbside
10 collection and the use of a material recovery facility to
11 process all the City's waste, both residential and
12 nonresidential.

13 Based on this information Board staff is
14 recommending Option 2 of the agenda item, which would
15 approve the revised new base year with staff
16 recommendations and accept the 1997-1998 and 1999-2000
17 biennial review findings, that the City has made a good
18 faith effort to implement diversion programs.

19 Representatives from the City are present to
20 answer any questions.

21 This concludes my presentation.

22 Thank you.

23 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Thanks, Zane.

24 Madam Chair.

25 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: I'd like to

1 move approval of Resolution 2002-524, request to change
2 base year to 1998 for the previously approved source
3 reduction and recycling element and consideration of the
4 1997-1998 and 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the
5 source reduction and recycling element and household
6 hazardous waste element for the City of San Fernando, Los
7 Angeles County.

8 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Second.

9 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Chair
10 Moulton-Patterson, a second by Mr. Medina.

11 Substitute the previous roll?

12 On consent?

13 Thank you, members.

14 Next item.

15 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Item Number 28 is
16 consideration of the 1999-2000 biennial review findings
17 and consideration of issuance of a compliance order
18 relative to the 1999-2000 biennial review findings for the
19 City of Fortuna in Humboldt County.

20 And Jill Simmons will make this presentation.

21 MS. SIMMONS: Good morning, Chairman Jones and
22 Committee Members.

23 The City of Fortuna submitted an SB 1066 time
24 extension application for meeting the 50-percent diversion
25 requirement. After a Board staff review it was determined

1 that the request was incomplete.

2 The city intended to revise the application. But
3 when reviewing it in relationship to the history, current
4 actions, and future goals discussed in this SRRE, several
5 inconsistencies were found. To complicate matters City
6 staff had significant difficulty determining current
7 diversion program implementation and developing the
8 revised plan of correction.

9 Board staff determined, and city staff agreed,
10 that the best solution would be the issuance of a
11 compliance order that would include a detailed workplan
12 and in-depth assistance from Board staff.

13 Board staff is bringing forward its biennial
14 review findings that the City has failed to adequately
15 implement programs to achieve the 50-percent diversion
16 requirement for 2000. The city's 1999 diversion rate was
17 31 percent and 34 percent in 2000.

18 Board staff, therefore, recommends the Board
19 consider issuing the City a compliance order.

20 This concludes my presentation. Are there any
21 questions?

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: I have one question.

23 The city's got one hauler. How could they not
24 verify the programs that that hauler's supposed to be
25 doing?

1 MS. SIMMONS: I think part of the problem was is
2 that the City staff is relatively new now and just was
3 having difficulty assessing the current programs that had
4 been implemented.

5 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Right. Yeah, I mean I don't
6 doubt it. I just -- you know, it's too bad.

7 There was a lot of ash generated in Fortuna. I
8 don't know if those facilities are still up and running.
9 But one of the things they got to look at is where that
10 stuff's going and if it's being used as positive reuse or
11 if it's still being disposed of along the beaches or in
12 the old site.

13 All right. Mr. Medina.

14 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Thank you, Chair Jones.

15 I'd like to move Resolution 2002-525, for the
16 '99-2000 biennial review findings for the source reduction
17 and recycling element and household hazardous waste
18 element in consideration of issuance of a compliance order
19 relative to the '99-2000 biennial review findings for the
20 City of Fortuna, Humboldt County.

21 COMMITTEE MEMBER MOULTON-PATTERSON: Second.

22 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Got a motion by Mr. Medina, a
23 second by Chair Moulton-Patterson.

24 Substitute the previous roll?

25 On consent?

1 So done.

2 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: We have one more item,
3 and that is 52, and it's AF in your packet. It's under
4 "other".

5 And this item was continued from the July Board
6 meeting. The jurisdiction committed to the Board that
7 they would submit a revised base year by September 1st and
8 we'd have it agendized.

9 We just received the revised base-year study. We
10 haven't had a chance to look at it at all. We'd like to
11 keep this item on the agenda for the Board meeting so that
12 we have time to at least evaluate what they submitted to
13 us.

14 CHAIRPERSON JONES: That's fine with me, Mr.
15 Schiavo.

16 Members, this is one that, if you remember, we
17 had it on the Committee meeting to actually put them on a
18 compliance order. They offered a letter a couple of days
19 before the meeting. We all agreed to give them the time
20 rather than to put them on compliance.

21 But definitely -- I mean they assured us -- in
22 fact we gave them extra time. As I remember, we gave them
23 an extra month.

24 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: Yes, we did.

25 CHAIRPERSON JONES: So, yeah, let's keep it on

1 and check this thing out and let us know. Because if it's
2 not what it needs to be, then we're going to have to go
3 back to our issue of a compliance order.

4 Is that reasonable, members?

5 COMMITTEE MEMBER MEDINA: Yes.

6 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Mr. Schiavo, is there
7 anything else?

8 DEPUTY DIRECTOR SCHIAVO: That concludes all our
9 items.

10 CHAIRPERSON JONES: Anybody in the public want to
11 speak?

12 I want to thank Mr. Medina for having to turn
13 around and head back up this way. Like Mr. Eaton, he had
14 other commitments when this thing got scheduled. And
15 unfortunately one was a heck of a lot further away than
16 the other. So we appreciate it, members. Thanks.

17 This is adjourned.

18 Thanks, staff.

19 (Thereupon the California Integrated Waste
20 Management Board, Diversion, Planning and
21 Local Assistance Committee meeting
22 adjourned at 11:00 a.m.)

23

24

25

1 CERTIFICATE OF REPORTER

2 I, JAMES F. PETERS, a Certified Shorthand
3 Reporter of the State of California, and Registered
4 Professional Reporter, do hereby certify:

5 That I am a disinterested person herein; that the
6 foregoing California Integrated Waste Management,
7 Diversion, Planning and Local Assistance Committee meeting
8 was reported in shorthand by me, James F. Peters, a
9 Certified Shorthand Reporter of the State of California,
10 and thereafter transcribed into typewriting.

11 I further certify that I am not of counsel or
12 attorney for any of the parties to said meeting nor in any
13 way interested in the outcome of said meeting.

14 IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand
15 this 18th day of September, 2002.

16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23 JAMES F. PETERS, CSR, RPR
24 Certified Shorthand Reporter
25 License No. 10063